

### **REMARKS**

#### **Status of Application:**

In the Office Action mailed on April 4, 2005, claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 14, 17,-20, 24, 27, 28, 32 and 35-51 were rejected over various cited references, and claims 1, 2 and 44 were objected to for various informalities.

Applicants filed a Notice of Appeal on September 2, 2005. This amendment is submitted together with a Request for Continuing Examination (RCE) and a three-month extension of time.

#### **Claim Amendments to Address Informalities and Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2 and 44 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. In addition, claims 10, 19, 37, 46, 49 and 51 have been amended to correct various informalities. No new matter has been added. The amendment to claim 19, which now depends from claims 9 or 10, provides proper antecedent basis for the phrase "the first or second inlet layers".

#### **Additional Claim Amendments**

Furthermore claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include the following language. Claim 1 now recites that there is "an inlet layer located on the walls extending for only part of the length from the inlet end toward the outlet end and defining a first zone, the inlet layer comprising an inlet composition comprising at least one inlet component selected from inlet base metal oxides fixed in the first zone." Independent claim 10 has been similarly amended to now recite that "the first inlet layer extending for only part of the length from the inlet end toward the outlet end and defining a first zone, the first inlet layer comprising a first inlet composition comprising at least one first inlet component selected from first inlet base metal oxides fixed in the first zone." Support for these amendments can be found at least at page 11, line 24 through page 12, line 11 of the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 38 and 42-45 were rejected in the Office Action as allegedly being anticipated by Domesle et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,588,707. Domesle et al. fails to teach the article of presently amended claim 1, namely a wall flow honeycomb substrate in which a first inlet layer extends for only part of the length from the inlet toward the outlet end and fixed in a first zone. The terms "fixed" and "zone" are defined in the specification. As noted in the specification at page 11, lines 35-40 is that components, particularly soluble components such as precious metals are fixed in their respective zones. By fixing components such as precious metals within their respective zones a monolithic honeycomb can be multifunctional with minimum and preferably no migration of the components from zone to zone, particularly during manufacture of the honeycomb. Another advancement of the articles of the present invention, as explained in applicants' specification at pages 12, lines 5-11 is that there is a minimum of component migration even where a composition from one zone overlaps with the composition in another zone. The fixing of components in their respective zones can be achieved by chemically or thermally fixing the components within their respective zones.

Domesle et al. fail to teach a zoned wall flow honeycomb substrate in which components are fixed within a zone. Domesle et al. are silent on the concept of zoning and fixing components within a zone or taking steps that would fix components within a zone. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 28 and 42-45 is respectfully traversed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As noted on page 9, paragraph 14, of the last Office Action, the Domesle et al. reference is common to all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The deficiencies in Domesle et al., namely, the failure to disclose or suggest fixing components within a zone, are not cured by any of the secondary references relied upon in rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claims 1, 2, 28 and 42-45, the claims rejected under 35

Application No. 08/873,979  
Amendment  
January 30, 2006

U.S.C. § 103 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants reiterate and incorporate by reference the arguments made with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in the amendment submitted on December 17, 2004 and contained on pages 14-17.

The undersigned has been authorized by Richard A. Negin, Reg. No. 28,649, an attorney of record in the subject application, to prepare and file this Amendment on behalf of the Assignee. Correspondence should continue to be directed to Chief Patent Counsel, Engelhard Corporation, 101 Wood Avenue, P.O. Box 770, Iselin, NJ, 08830-0770.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced patent application in view of the foregoing amendment is respectfully requested. A petition for a three month extension of time is enclosed. If any other fees are due, however, the USPTO is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3329.

Dated: January 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Scott S. Servilla

Telephone: (732) 815-0404

Engelhard Corporation  
101 Wood Avenue, P.O. Box 770  
Iselin, NJ 08830-0770